UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,914	07/25/2006	Andreas Habich	12810-00316-US	3158
	7590 08/03/201 SOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 2207		DUBOIS, PHILIP A		
WILMINGTON, DE 19899			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1781	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/586,914	HABICH ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		PHILIP DUBOIS	1781				
Th Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication apaply	pears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Res	sponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25</u> .	luly 2006					
·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	s action is non-final.					
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
0100	in accordance with the practice under	Ex parto Quayro, 1000 O.B.	. 11, 100 0.0. 210.				
Disposition of	of Claims						
4)⊠ Cla	im(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the applicatio	٦.					
4a)	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) <u></u> Cla	im(s) is/are allowed.						
6) <u></u> Cla	6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
•	im(s) is/are objected to.						
·	im(s) <u>1-33</u> are subject to restriction and/o	election requirement.					
·	· · · —	•					
Application I	Papers						
9) □ The	specification is objected to by the Examir	er.					
10) <u></u> The	drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b)□ objected to b	by the Examiner.				
Арр	licant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Rep	lacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CI	FR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice of [3] Informatio	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) n Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) s)/Mail Date 10/5/2009; 12/04/2007; 07/25/2006.	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application ·				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted as follows:

Group I, claim(s) 1-10, drawn to the enzyme formulation.

Group II, claim(s) 11-33, drawn to a process for the preparation of phosphatasecontaining granules.

The inventions listed as Groups I do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Groups I and II lack a special technical feature in view of the prior art. WO 98/540980 discloses a process for the preparation of an enzyme-containing granulate where an aqueous enzyme-containing liquid is mixed with an edible carbohydrate-based solid carrier, such as starch, mechanically processed into granules, and subsequently dried. This enzyme granulate is suitable for the manufacture of animal feed compositions by mixing feed ingredients with granulates, steam treating the mixture and pelleting the mixture.

Page 3

WO03/040398 describes heat stable aqueous solutions or gels comprising a biologically effective amount of a protein and an effective stabilizing amount of a polysaccharide gum. Also disclosed are lyophilized compositions having biologically activity, where such lyophilized compositions are formed by lyophilizing the stabilized solutions or gels.

As WO03/040398 shows that the stabilizing role of these polysaccharide gums (see page 6, first paragraph) and proteins was known, the skilled artisan would have considered it obvious to incorporate such stabilizers into the process of WO 98/540980.

In view of the above, Groups I and II lack a special technical feature.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

2. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/586,914 Page 4

Art Unit: 1781

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/586,914 Page 5

Art Unit: 1781

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIP DUBOIS whose telephone number is (571) 272-6107. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30am-7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PHILIP DUBOIS/ Examiner Art Unit 1781

/Keith D. Hendricks/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1781